

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A-1**APPENDIX OF AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' ARGUMENT THAT STATE ANTITRUST LAWS HAVE THE SAME SCOPE AS FEDERAL ANTITRUST LAWS**

<u>State</u>	<u>Authority</u>
Arizona	<i>Laborers' & Operating Engineers' Util. Agreement Health & Welfare Trust Fund for Arizona v. Philip Morris, Inc.</i> , 42 F. Supp. 2d 943, 950 (D. Ariz. 1999).
California	<i>Rick-Mik Enters., Inc. v. Equilon Enters. LLC</i> , 532 F.3d 963, 976 (9th Cir. 2008); <i>Cnty. of Tuolumne v. Sonora Cnty. Hosp.</i> , 236 F.3d 1148, 1160 (9th Cir. 2001); <i>Nova Designs, Inc. v. Scuba Retailers Ass'n</i> , 202 F.3d 1088, 1092 (9th Cir. 2000).
District of Columbia	<i>Atlantic Coast Airlines Holdings, Inc. v. Mesa Air Grp., Inc.</i> , 295 F. Supp. 2d 75, 89 n.7 (D. Col. 2003).
Hawaii	<i>Hoilien v. OneWest Bank, FSB</i> , No. CV. 11-00357 DAE-RLP, 2012 WL 1379318 at *13 (D. Hawaii Apr. 20, 2012).
Illinois	<i>Hackman v. Dickerson Realtors, Inc.</i> , 520 F. Supp. 2d 954, 966 (N.D. Ill. 2007).
Iowa	<i>Double D Spotting Service, Inc. v. Supervalu, Inc.</i> , 136 F.3d 554, 561 (8th Cir. 1998).
Kansas	<i>In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.</i> , 223 F.R.D. 335, 350 (E.D. Penn. 2004).
Maine	<i>Davric Maine Corp. v. Rancourt</i> , 216 F.3d 143, 149 (1st Cir. 2000).
Michigan	<i>Salmon v. City of Cadillac</i> , No. 263586, 2005 WL 3416119, at *5 (Mich. Ct. App. Dec. 13, 2005).
Minnesota	<i>Midwest Comm v. Minn. Twins</i> , 779 F.2d 444, 454 (8th Cir. 1985).
Mississippi	<i>Pope v. Mississippi Real Estate Comm'n</i> , 872 F.2d 127, 129 (5th Cir. 1989).
Nebraska	Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-829.
Nevada	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.050; <i>Boulware v. Nevada Dep't. of Human Resources</i> , 960 F.2d 793, 800 (9th Cir. 1992).

New Mexico	N.M. Stat. § 57-1-15; <i>Singh v. Memorial Med. Ctr., Inc.</i> , 536 F. Supp. 2d 1244, 1247 n.3 (D.N.M 2008).
New York	<i>Doron Precision Sys., Inc. v. FAAC, Inc.</i> , 423 F. Supp. 2d 173, 192-93 (S.D.N.Y. 2006).
North Carolina	<i>Rose v. Vulcan Materials Co.</i> , 194 S.E.2d 521, 530 (N.C.1973).
North Dakota	<i>In re Elec. Books Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 11 MD 2293 DLC, 2014 WL 2535112, at *15 (S.D.N.Y. June 5, 2014).
South Dakota	<i>Assam Drug Co., Inc. v. Miller Brewing Co., Inc.</i> , 798 F.2d 311, 313 (8th Cir. 1986).
Tennessee	<i>Rockholt Furniture, Inc. v. Kincaid Furniture Co.</i> , No. 1:96CV588, 1998 WL 1661384, at *7 (E.D. Tenn. July 6, 1998).
Vermont	<i>Vermont Mobile Home Owners' Ass'n v. Lapierre</i> , 94 F. Supp. 2d 519, 523 (D. Vt. 2000).
West Virginia	<i>Princeton Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Erie Ins. Co.</i> , 225 W.Va. 178, 183-84 (W.Va. 2009).
Wisconsin	<i>State v. Waste Mgmt. of Wis., Inc.</i> , 261 N.W.2d 147, 151-53 (Wis. 1978).

EXHIBIT A-2

**APPENDIX OF AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' ARGUMENT THAT
STATE CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS HAVE THE SAME SCOPE AS FEDERAL
CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS**

<u>State</u>	<u>Authority</u>
California	<i>Cel-Tech Commc'nns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co.</i> , 20 Cal. 4th 163, 185 (1999); <i>Bowen v. Ziasun Technologies, Inc.</i> , 116 Cal. App. 4th 777, 788-89 (2004).
Florida	Fla. Stat. § 501.202(3).
Hawaii	<i>Davis v. Four Seasons Hotel Ltd.</i> , 122 Hawai'i 423, 228 P.3d 303, 310 (2010).
Nebraska	<i>State ex rel. Douglas v. Assoc. Grocers of Neb. Co-op, Inc.</i> , 332 N.W.2d 690, 693 (Neb. 1983).
Nevada	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.050; <i>Boulware v. Nevada Dep't. of Human Resources</i> , 960 F.2d 793, 800 (9th Cir. 1992).
New Mexico	N.M. Stat. § 57-12-4.
New York	<i>State v. Colo. State Christian Coll. of Church of Inner Power, Inc.</i> , 76 Misc. 2d 50, 54, 346 N.Y.S.2d 482, 487 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1973); <i>People ex rel. Spitzer v. Applied Card Sys., Inc.</i> , 805 N.Y.S.2d 175, 178 (N.Y. App. Div. 2005).
North Carolina	<i>Henderson v. U. S. Fid. & Guar. Co.</i> , 488 S.E.2d 234, 239 (N.C. 1997).
Vermont	Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 9, §§ 2451; 2453(b).
Washington	<i>State v. Black</i> , 100 Wash.2d 793, 806, 676 P.2d 963, 967 (1984).